





THE REAL PRESENCE

NOT

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

No. I.

A SERMON

BY THE

REV. J. GOING, M.A.,

INCUMBENT OF S. PAUL'S, LORRIMORE SQUARE, WALWORTH.

"Let us forbear on both sides needless and unprofitable disputes. Unless Thou, Lord, hadst said it, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood,' who would have believed it? Unless Thou hadst said, O holy Christ, 'Take, eat; drink ye all of this, who durst have touched it?'—DR. SUTTON, *Prebendary of Westminster*, 1605.

LONDON:

G. PEVERALL, PRINTER, WALWORTH ROAD.

1867.

A SERMON, &c.

"And He took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying: This is my Body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying: This Cup is the New testament in my Blood, which is shed for you."—S. LUKE xxii. 19, 20.

MY BRETHREN,

I desire to state to you this evening the doctrine of the Real Presence, and its evidence, as briefly as I can. Next Sunday evening I hope, by God's blessing, to consider the objections commonly urged against that doctrine. Time would not permit me to attempt both tasks in one sermon; indeed it will need great effort to give even an outline of the case in two sermons of ordinary length.

The whole question of the union of spirit and matter is most mysterious. How does that union begin? Why does it terminate?

By certain Divine laws a portion of matter which we call the body becomes united with a living soul, as the abode of that soul, and a human being is called into existence. In the course of a long life the material substance with which the spirit was thus united is changed many times, so that the corpse of the aged man there is probably not one particle of the material substance with which his spirit was united when he lay as an infant in his mother's arms.*

And now why is the spirit separated from that piece of material substance which we call his corpse? We can only answer, in the words of Holy Scripture, "The Lord gave,

* See Bishop Butler's Dissertation on Personal Identity.

and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.”*

The secret is with God. He hath never revealed to man what is the hidden principle of the union of spirit and matter; and if there be one subject above all others upon which man should not dogmatize, this is that subject: “God made man of the dust of the earth,” a senseless, lifeless form. “He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.”† We accept the fact, but cannot understand the mystery.

But incomprehensible as is the union of created spirit with material substance, how shall we speak of the marvellous mystery of revelation, which declares the union of the material substance of human flesh with the Uncreated Essence of the Second Person of the All Holy Trinity. “God of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the world, and Man of the Substance of His mother, born in the world,” what Bishop Butler calls “the Self-existent Substance, i.e. the Uncreated Spirit, being united with the material substance of human flesh.

Nor did the events of His Death, His Resurrection, His Ascension, dissolve this union. Two whole and perfect Natures, the Godhead and the Manhood, abide in Him still, never to be divided.

We must not be as the heretics§ of old, who imagined a phantom Christ. He was no phantom, even after His Resurrection. It was after His Resurrection that He said, “Behold My Hands and My Feet, that it is I Myself; handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye know Me have; and when He had thus spoken, He shewed them His Hands and His Feet;” nay more, “they gave Him a pi-

* Job i. 21.

† See Address to the Congregation of St. Alban's, Holborn, by Rev. A. Mackonochie, page 11.

‡ Analogy, part I. cap i.

§ The Docetæ.

of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb, and He took it, and did eat before them."* The Wounds were in His Hands and in His Side, which all could see, and touch. He saith to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My Hands," so that the very finger could be put into the Wounds. "And reach hither thy hand and thrust it into My Side, and be not faithless but believing."†

When S. Paul contrasts the natural body of the first Adam and his children with the Spiritual Body of the Second Adam,‡ and those who in the resurrection shall share His likeness, he does not mean to deny the reality of that Body, which he calls Spiritual; for the same Apostle, writing after our Lord's Ascension, tells us we are "members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones,"§ which could not be, had they ceased to exist. It is because of the new powers and properties which He infused into man's nature, in His Own person, and of which we in our measure shall one day be partakers, that His Body is called a Spiritual body, as distinguished from the natural body, derived from the first Adam, to which such powers have not been imparted.

There is great danger that we should regard the Incarnation as simply a temporary contrivance to enable Christ to die, and *not rather* as the permanent instrument of that Eternal Mediation which belongs to His office as the Second Adam, and of which Hooker speaks when he says: "There is no union of God with man, without that Mean between both, which is Both."|| His Manhood, Real and Essential, is as necessary to His Mediation in Heaven, as it was to His Death on the cross.

But though we must believe our Lord's Manhood to be as Real as our own, yet we must not believe It to be limited by the same conditions. "It is a law which God

* S. Luke xxiv. 39—43.

† S. John xx. 27.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 44—46.

§ Eph. v. 30.

|| Hooker's Eccl. Pol. Book v. ch. L. § 3.

"hath impressed upon physical nature that two bodies cannot
 "be in the same place at the same time, and yet we receive
 "without doubting that our Lord in His Spiritual Body
 "passed on the morning of the resurrection through the
 "sealed tomb, for the angels rolled away the stone to show
 "that 'He *was* risen.'* He passed through the closed doors
 "so that the disciples *thought* that it was a spirit.† We could
 "not stay to inquire in what way the substance of His Body
 "passed through the substance of the closed doors; enough
 "that God has said it. But as His Body passed it must have
 "been in the same place with the doors, penetrating, but not
 "displacing them."‡

He set aside the laws of physical nature as much when
 He walked on the water before His Crucifixion, as when He
 rose on the yielding air in His Ascension.

I suppose that few would doubt that when the people of
 Nazareth "*led* Him unto the brow of the hill, whereto
 their city was built, that they might cast Him down head
 long, but He, passing through the midst of them, went His
 way,"§ He must have made Himself in some supernatural
 way invisible to them. And surely it must have been
 something of the same kind, when the Jews "took up
 stones to cast at Him; but Jesus hid Himself and went out of
 the Temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed
 by."|| And we read elsewhere that when He was actually
 speaking to them, they sought again to take Him, "but He
 escaped out of their hands."¶ S. Mary Magdalene supposed
 Him to be the gardener until she heard His Voice.** The
 Disciples, though they talked with Him on the way, did not

* Such is the meaning of the Greek word *ἡγέρθη*. S. Matt. xxviii. 6. S.
 Mark xvi. 6. S. Luke xxiv. 6.

† S. Luke xxiv. 37. S. John xx. 19.

‡ E. B. Pusey, D.D. "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," p. 28.

§ S. Luke iv. 29.

|| S. John viii. 59.

¶ S. John x. 39.

** S. John xx. 15.

recognize Him until in the breaking of bread they knew Him for a moment, ere He vanished from their sight; * but S. John, when he saw Him on the sea shore, cried out at once, "It is the Lord;" † and S. Thomas exclaimed, "My Lord and my God." ‡ As He willed, so it was; they saw Him, or saw Him not, they knew Him, or knew Him not.

In His Transfiguration § He shewed by anticipation what His Body would be in His Glorified State; it was a momentary glimpse of the "King in His Beauty," || a manifestation of the Son of God in His glory flashing out for a moment in the days of His humiliation; but His Body was as *Real* when transfigured as It was before or after. He made It *manifest* as a Spiritual Body, but might have said *then* as he did *afterwards*, "a spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, as ye see I have."

His Flesh being conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of a pure Virgin, and united for ever to the Divine Nature, while It possessed all the properties that belong to man's nature, could not but be endued with powers which belong not to our natural bodies, and could not but be released from that bondage to the laws of matter from which we in this world can never escape.

Surely then His Own Person is the proof that no laws of matter must be quoted against Him by whose word matter itself was called into being; who allied Himself so wondrously to the material substance of human flesh, yet subjected not Himself to its laws, but emancipated It from them in Himself. He who could use the material substance of human flesh for the Divine purposes of His Incarnation, can use any other material substance He pleases to extend the Presence of His Spiritual Body and His Precious Blood.

* S. Luke xxiv. 16—31. † S. John xxi. 7. ‡ S. John xx. 28.

§ S. Matt. xvii. 2. S. Mark ix. 2.

|| Isaiah xxxiii. 17. S. Luke xxiv. 39.

Certainly Holy Scripture does seem to speak of a real reception of the Real Body and Blood of our ascended Lord through material elements. When He said "I am the Living Bread which came down from Heaven; if any man eat of This Bread he shall live for ever, and the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world;"* the Jews at once associated His words with the idea of material substance which they could eat, and said: "How can This Man give us His Flesh to eat?"† Nor did He try to separate His words from this offensive association. He merely ignored the difficulty, and said: "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you:"‡ words which might seem even more grossly material than those He used before. "Many therefore of his disciples when they had heard this said: This is an hard saying, who can hear it?"§ As it is now, so it was then; "many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him."|| How many leave His Church *now* for the same reason for which *they* left Him?

It never occurred to those Jews, or to those disciples, as it has to modern divines, to say that eating the flesh of a teacher means obeying his words, or having faith in his precepts, or trusting to his promises, or having confidence in his merits, or being guided by his instructions. If this was what was meant by giving His Flesh to eat, the Jews would not have pronounced it to be impossible, nor would His disciples have called it a "hard saying," and left their Lord because of it.

No theory has ever been proposed which fits our Lord's words naturally in their plain grammatical meaning except the theory of the Real Presence. Ingenious objections without number have been alleged to show that that doctrine

* S. John vi. 51—53.

† S. John vi. 52.

‡ S. John vi. 53.

§ S. John vi. 60.

|| S. John vi. 66.

cannot be true ; but the objectors have never been able to state *their own* case ; they think they can say what our Lord did *not* mean, but they are at their wit's end when they would say what He *did* mean.

Our Lord's words must have been either literal or figurative. If used figuratively they must have conveyed the same meaning to our Lord's hearers that the expressions always conveyed when figuratively employed among the Jews ; but the phrases to eat the flesh of any person always meant to seek his hurt or ruin by violence or slander, as when David says (Psalm xxvii. 2) : " Mine enemies and my foes came upon me *to eat up my flesh*." Job's appeal to his miserable comforters to leave off reviling him is conveyed by the same figure : " Why do ye persecute me . . . and are not *satisfied with my flesh*." (Job. xix. 22.) Micah (iii. 3) denounces the oppressors of the poor in the words " who also *eat the flesh of my people*." Ecclesiastes (iv. 5), describing how the fool ruins himself, says "*he eateth his own flesh*." S. James (v. 3) telling the ungodly rich men of his day that their wicked and selfish hoarding would bring upon them the wrath of God at the last day, says : " Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall witness against you, and shall *eat your flesh* as it were fire ;" and the expression of S. Paul (Gal. v. 15), in which he bids the Christians not to "*bite and devour*" one another in party quarrels, is another form of the same figure of speech ; so that, if figuratively employed, our Lord's words about eating His Flesh would have recommended His hearers to treat Him with violence and persecution as the surest way to eternal life.*

Moreover, to taste the blood of an animal, much more the blood of a man, was an abomination to the Jews, and would have been to them a most repulsive and strange illustration if used by the Saviour as a *mere figure* to teach and recom-

* Learned men tell us that to this day the same form of expression exists in the Arabic and Syrian languages in the same meaning as above ; viz. , doing violence to any one or slandering him.

mend his doctrine. As an illustration pleasing to a Jew, our Lord might as well have chosen *swines' flesh* as human blood. Nothing but the need of telling men the *literal truth* would have made Him tell the Jews that they must eat His Flesh and drink His Blood.

It may be safely asserted that no writer, either ancient or modern, ever used the words eating the flesh of a teacher in the sense of loving him, trusting him, being guided by him, or being taught by him. Unless indeed S. John, and other writers who have copied his words, be supposed to be exceptions.

But why should S. John be supposed to be an exception to the plain use of language in every age, in every land? Surely when the Saviour said, "The Bread that I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," His meaning was that He would give His Body—His Real Body—to die upon the cross for the life of the world; and when He goes on to speak of giving His Flesh, the same Flesh, to men to eat, He must mean the same Body which He gave to *die*, and It must be as Real when given to *eat* as It had been when given to suffer death.

But S. John is not alone. Four other writers, of equal authority, use similar language. St. Matthew says: "Jesus took bread and said, Take, eat; this is my Body," and "this is my Blood of the New Testament."* S. Mark says, "Take, eat; this is my Body," "this is my Blood of the New Testament."† S. Luke, "this is my Body which is given for you;" "this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood."‡ S. Paul uses the words, "Take, eat; this is my Body which is broken for you;" "this Cup is the New Testament in my blood."§

And S. Paul says he "received this of the Lord."|| Now that must have been after our Lord's Ascension, for S. Paul never received any instructions from our Lord before that

* S. Matthew xxvi. 26, 27.

† S. Mark xiv. 22, 23.

‡ S. Luke xxii. 19, 20

§ 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25,

|| 1 Cor. xi. 23,

event, it was probably when S. Paul was “caught up to the third Heaven;” * so that our Lord, in Heaven, revealed to S. Paul the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in the very same words in which, before His Passion, He had revealed the same doctrine to the other Apostles. And are those words so unimportant that they may be explained away at our pleasure?—words repeated by our Saviour in Heaven exactly as they had been uttered by Him on earth.

S. Paul says also: “The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?” †

When he upbraids the Corinthians for their irreverence in turning the Lord’s Supper into a carnal feast, he accounts for their “eating and drinking unworthily” by their “not discerning the Lord’s Body, ‡ and calls them “guilty of The Body and Blood of the Lord.” § How could they be so if He were not there? And how should they “discern the Lord’s Body.” By faith truly; but faith discerns that which *is*, and not that which *is not*. It is the very office of faith to discern that which is invisible, but which is notwithstanding real.

Certainly all these passages seem to imply that, when certain conditions are fulfilled, our Lord vouchsafes to cause His Blessed Body and Blood really to *co-exist* with the material elements of bread and wine.

And unless we have made up our minds to dogmatize on the subject of *God’s power*, and to say that God could become Man, and lie as a Babe in His mother’s arms, be hungry and weary, nay suffer and die as Man, be visible or invisible, palpable or impalpable, as He Himself pleased while here on earth, but that since His Ascension into Heaven He cannot cause His manhood to exist in an

* 2 Cor. xii. 2.

† 1 Cor. x. 16.

‡ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

§ 1 Cor. xi. 27.

invisible and spiritual manner in the Blessed Sacrament—unless we are prepared to say this, we shall take the plain words of Scripture in their plain meaning and believe that when He said “This is my Body,” “This is my Blood” (as He blessed the bread and the wine), He was providing us for ever with an external machinery whereby we should “verily and indeed” * eat His Flesh and drink His Blood.

And this idea alone is consistent with the general laws of sacrifice as they are laid down in Holy Scripture—and The Divine Victim was no exception to those laws; on the contrary, He was the most illustrious example of their application; He came not to destroy, but to fulfil them.†—It is because the laws of sacrifice were fulfilled in Him that He is called “the Lamb of God,”‡ “a Lamb as it had been slain,”§ “the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world,”|| “our Passover sacrificed for us.” ¶

Now does not S. Paul state a fundamental law of the Mosaic system of sacrifice, when he says, “Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?”** Could any Jew who refused to eat of the Paschal victim be a partaker of the blessings of the Paschal sacrifice? The eating of the flesh of the Paschal lamb was as much a part of the sacrificial act as the slaying of the victim was. To “eat the passover” was the common expression.†† Moses writes, “Thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of the Lord thy God, and the blood of thy sacrifices shall be poured out upon the altar of the Lord thy God, and thou shalt eat the flesh.”‡‡ And when the great Sacrifice for the sins of the world—“the *very* Paschal Lamb” §§—was offered

* Catechism.

† S. Matt. v. 17.

‡ S. John i. 29 and 36.

§ Rev. v. 6.

|| Rev. xiii. 8.

¶ 1 Cor. v. 7.

** 1 Cor. x. 18.

†† Exodus xii. 3—11; S. Luke xxii. 8, 11, 15, 16.

‡‡ Deut. xii. 27.

§ § Proper Preface for Easter Day.

up once for all, how could generation after generation be partakers of that Sacrifice once offered?—how could it be “a Sacrifice for sins for ever?”* unless some means had been provided by which men could continually eat the Flesh of the victim.

But sacraments not only unite us *with the Atonement*; they are also “*extensions of the Incarnation*.” Christ came to regenerate mankind, and He must first redeem those whom He would regenerate. Were it possible to regenerate without redeeming us, we should still lie under the sin we inherited in our birth, or had committed before our regeneration. We should be “*members of Christ*” under *Adam’s* sin, and sanctified men, but still unpardoned. Therefore Christ *died* to redeem us, but He was *born* to regenerate us, and the former was but an accident of the latter. It would be of no avail to start the bankrupt afresh unless you paid his previous debts; but the end and aim is to start him afresh, with new powers, new hopes, new aims, new life. To change the pedigree of men—to cause them to inherit from the Second Adam, and not from the first—to appropriate to men the blessings of which the Apostle speaks when he says: “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is;”†—this was the object of the Incarnation. “We shall be like *Him*.” “As is the earthy” (the first Adam) “such are they also that are earthy, as is the Heavenly” (the Second Adam), “such are they also that are heavenly; and as we have borne the image of the earthy we shall also bear the Image of the Heavenly,”‡ the children of the first Adam “after his kind,” the children of the Second Adam “after his kind.”§ The

* Heb. x. 12.

† 1 Cor. xv. 48, 49.

‡ 1 S. John iii. 2.

§ Gen. i. 11—25.

hereditary principle which ruined man in the first Adam *by nature* comes to man's rescue in the Second Adam *by grace*.

But the Second Adam did not extend His Renewed Nature by the natural order; He left no earthly seed, but adopted the children of the first Adam as His own. In His Own Person He purified man's nature, for He took it into God, and that not by human generation, but by the conception of the Holy Ghost, thereby not only expunging from man's being the corruption which Adam had imported into it, but even making it "partaker of the Divine nature."* This He did first in His Own Person, and secondly in all who are "members of Christ."

Do we refuse this elevation as too high for us? Do we shrink from this nearness to God as something terrible? Alas! we do. And this is the reason why men deny His Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and also that affiliating power whereby, as the Second Adam, He regenerates or changes the pedigree of all who, in the waters of baptism, are made His members.

But He feeds *with His Body* those whom He has united *to His Body*. "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me."†

The Holy Eucharist can never be appreciated by him who does not understand it as an extension of the Incarnation, in the way of *continual sustenance*, to those to whom the Incarnation had been already extended in the way of *the new birth*.

The very essence of the Sacramental system is "the extension of the Incarnation"—the nature of the first Adam was extended to other individuals by *natural birth*; the nature

* 2 S. Peter i. 4.

† S. John vi. 56, 57.

of the Second Adam by the sacramental system. Jeremy Taylor, who was no advocate of exaggerated doctrine, writes: "Consonant to which doctrine the Fathers, by an elegant expression, call the blessed Sacrament 'the extension of the Incarnation.'"*

As there is no doctrine of Holy Scripture expressed with such exactness and repeated so often, and with such precision, always in the very same words, and that both on earth and in heaven, and by our Lord Himself, so there is no doctrine respecting which there is such unvarying and unanimous consent among the early Christian writers.

And here let me say that there is a very foolish way of talking among some people, as if no evidence must be attended to in explaining the Bible except what is found in the Bible itself. Certainly no one attempts to understand any other ancient book without getting all the light they can from the writings of those who lived at the same time as the author, or a little before or after him. God forbid I should ever use any evidence outside the Bible against the Bible; if any writer is found contradicting the Bible, I say with S. Paul, "Let God be true, but every man a liar." But if I find evidence of facts that throw light upon the Bible in other writings beside the Bible, I am bound, as a lover of truth, to use that evidence, if it be real evidence, to explain the Bible, just as much as if I drew it from the Bible only. Many facts of history which are not in the Bible are just as certain as if they were in the Bible; there is no more doubt that there was such a man as Julius Cæsar, and that the chief events of his life really happened, than if you had his life and deeds recorded in the Bible; and if any event of his life happened to explain some mysterious statement in the Bible, or some doubtful prophecy, you would be as much bound to take

* "Worthy Communicant," ch. 1, sec. 2, near the end.

that event into account in forming your opinion as if it was actually recorded in the Bible. If you know it happened you are bound to act upon what you know, no matter how you know it. It would be ridiculous to say "I know it is true, but because it is not in the Bible I will not take it into account in explaining the Bible."

Now there is no doubt that S. Ignatius was consecrated Bishop of Antioch by S. Peter about the year 43, *i. e.*, ten years after our Lord's Ascension, and died a martyr about the year 107, and he writes: "They [the Docetæ, who "denied that our Lord had a True Body] abstain from "Eucharist and Prayer, because they confess not that The "Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ."* And again: "Haste ye to partake of One Eucharist, for there is One Flesh of our Lord "Jesus Christ, One Cup for the uniting of His Blood, one "Altar."† Can we conceive that a bishop who lived in the times of the apostles, and received his consecration from S. Peter, mistook the teaching of the apostles, and of that Dear Lord for whom he died a martyr?

S. Justin Martyr, who was converted A. D. 133, and martyred A. D. 165, writes: "We have been taught that the "Food over which thanksgiving has been made by the "prayer of the word which is from Him is the Flesh and the "Blood of the Incarnate Jesus; for He having taken Bread "and given thanks, said: 'Do this in remembrance of Me, "this is My Body;' and likewise having taken the Cup and "given thanks, He said: 'This is My Blood.'"‡

He also mentions that the Bread, and also Wine and Water, were given to each of those present to partake of, thus not only refuting the doctrine of transubstantiation, which

* Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 7.

† Ep. ad Phil. n. 4.

‡ Fragm. Ep. ad Florin. in Euseb. H. E. v. 20. and Opp. p. 339, 40. ed. Ben.

denies that the Bread and Wine exist after Consecration, but also exposing the error of withholding the Cup from the laity, according to the Roman usage, and giving testimony of the most remote antiquity in favour of mixing Water with the Wine in Holy Communion.

S. Irenæus, writing about the year 167, and arguing with certain heretics, says: "How should they know certainly
 " that that Bread over which thanks are given is the Body of
 " their Lord, and that the Cup is the Cup of His Blood, if
 " they do not acknowledge Him as the Son of the Creator of
 " the world." Again: "He took that which of His creation
 " is bread, and gave thanks, saying, 'This is My Body;' and
 " likewise the cup, which is of that our creation, He con-
 " fessed to be His Blood, and taught that it is the New
 " Oblation of the New Testament, of which Malachi thus
 " presignified: 'In every place incense shall be offered unto
 " My Name, and a pure offering.'"* Arguing again with
 " heretics, he says: "If the Lord belonged to another
 " Father, how was it just that, taking Bread of this our
 " creation, He confessed that It was His Own Body, and
 " He affirmed that the Mingled Drink of the cup [the
 " mixed chalice] was His Own Blood."† Of the Ebionites,
 who used only water in the cup, and rejected the use of
 wine, he says, "They reject the *commixture* of the heavenly
 " cup, and will that there should only be water of this world,
 " not receiving God to their commixture,"‡ plainly implying
 that God *was* received to the commixture of the Catholic
 Church. But time would fail me. I have made extracts
 from three of the earliest writers, next to the Apostles, that
 refer to the subject. I have quoted them because they are
 the earliest writers, but might have quoted more than 100
 writers of the first three-and-a-half centuries following the
 Apostles, who all bear consistent testimony for the doctrine

* Ib. iv. 17, 5.

† Ib. iv. 33, 2.

‡ Ib. v. 1, 3, p. 293.

of the Real Presence, and none against it; and, I may add that many of them bear equally clear testimony against the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Moreover, the practices of the early Church bear the same testimony. The practice of receiving Holy Communion fasting, whatever may be our opinion of that practice, is a proof that the doctrine of the Real Presence was the doctrine of the Church.

Referring to the fact that the first Eucharist was celebrated immediately after the Paschal supper, S. Augustine writes: "Is then, for this reason, the Church universal to be censured, because men always receive fasting? for on this account it seemed good to the Holy Spirit; namely, that for the honour of so great a Sacrament the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of a Christian previously to other food.

"For on this account is that custom observed *throughout the whole world*. For neither ought the brethren, because the Lord gave that Sacrament after the meal, to assemble after dinner or supper for its reception, nor as those did whom the Apostle reproves, to mingle that Sacrament with their own table. For the Saviour, in order with more earnestness to commend the depth of that Mystery, wished to fix it as His last act in the hearts and memory of the disciples, from whom He was about to depart to His Passion.* And for this reason He gave no command about the order in which it should be afterwards received, that He might reserve this point for the Apostles, through whom He was about to set in order the Churches. For if He had prescribed this, that it should always be received *after* other food, I suppose that no one would have altered the custom."†

* Jeremy Taylor says He gave the Sacrament to them on "the Vespers of His Passion."—"Worthy Communicant," cap. I. sec. 2.

† 2 Ep. 54 ad Januar. § 7, 8, pp. 126, 127.

I suppose not, my brethren. Certainly *we* find it very hard to get people to come to an early Communion—except those few who have an intense belief in the Real Presence. *After-breakfast* communions, not to say *after-dinner* communions, are much more popular, as interfering so much less with men's love of ease and self indulgence, and therefore we must conclude that nothing less than apostolic order could have made the Church universal of S. Augustine's day adopt the practice of fasting communion, a custom, he says, "observed throughout the whole world;" and the doctrine of the Real Presence must have been the foundation of that custom, for, to men who believed that doctrine, it seemed instinctive and natural that, "for the honour of so great a Sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of a Christian previously to other food."

S. Augustine mentions another practice as universal in his day, which proves the same doctrine. I mean the practice of adoring the Blessed Saviour as really present in the Consecrated Elements. He writes "He walked here in very Flesh, and gave that very Flesh to us to eat for our Salvation, *and no one eateth THAT FLESH unless He Hath first worshipped;*"* and he adds, "not only that we sin not in worshipping It, but that we sin in not worshipping;" and S. Ambrose speaks of "the Flesh of Christ which to this day we adore in the Mysteries."† If Christ were not believed to be really present "in the Mysteries," such acts of adoration would have been idolatry.

But I may be told that, whatever the early Church may have believed and taught, the doctrine of the Real Presence was repudiated by our reformers. In reply let me ask those who tell us that the Body of Christ is no more in the Holy Eucharist than the absent bodies of Napoleon or Wellington

* In Ps. [xcviii.] xcix. n. 9 T. iv. p. 454, O. T.

† De Sp. S. III. 11, § 79, II. 604.

are in their marble busts, to weigh the following words from the "Homily of the Sacrament":—

"Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there
 "is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, NO UNTRUE FIGURE OF A THING ABSENT:
 "But, as the Scripture saith, *the Table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the*
Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the com-
munion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation,
which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction
with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby
not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win to their
*bodies a resurrection to immortality."**

The title of one of the Homilies in the Second Book, as given in the notification at the end of the First Book, is as follows:—"Of the due receiving of His [Christ's] Blessed Body and Blood under the Form of Bread and Wine."

Bishop Ridley, who died a martyr for the principles of the Reformation, arguing with a Roman Catholic, writes:—

"Both you and I agree herein, that in the Sacrament is the very, true, and
 "natural Body and Blood of Christ; even that Which was born of the Virgin
 "Mary; Which ascended into Heaven; Which sits on the right hand of God
 "the Father; Which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the
 "dead; only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being. We
 "confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner
 "of being there."—Works, edit. 1843, p. 274.

He charges the Roman writer as follows: "You make a
 "grosser kind of Being enclosing a Natural, a Lively, and a
 "Moving Body, under the shape of Bread and Wine;" and, he adds, "if you mean 'really and indeed,' so that thereby
 "you would include a Lively and a Moveable Body under
 "the forms of Bread and Wine, then in that sense is not
 "Christ's Body in the Sacrament, 'really and indeed?'" This passage is most important, as showing the kind of gross superstitious notions which our Reformers intended to reject when they rejected transubstantiation, but maintained the doctrine of the Real Presence. Whether any Roman Catholic in the world *now* believes or then believed in a "Lively Moveable and Moving Body" in the Blessed Sacrament is

* Homily of the Sacrament, p. 476.

quite another question. Yet that was an age of ignorance and superstition in many respects, and it is difficult to believe that such a man as Ridley would impute opinions to his adversaries wholly unwarranted by popular belief, however unsupported they may be by the authoritative creeds of the Roman Church.

Bishop Bilson (quoted by Bishop Mountagu), stating the case between us and the Church of Rome, writes:—

“The disagreement is only in *de modo præsentia*, [Concerning the manner “of The Presence]; the *thing* is yielded on either side, and there is in the “Holy Eucharist a Real Presence. ‘God forbid,’ said Bishop Bilson, ‘we “should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and “truly received of the faithful at the Lord’s Table. It is the doctrine that “we teach others, and comfort ourselves withal.’ (p. 779 of the subject.) *Appeal*, c. 30 *init.* p. 289.

Bishop Overall wrote the latter part of the Church Catechism, that about the Sacraments, which is therefore not his testimony only, but that of the English Church: now in the Catechism it is said that the outward part of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is “bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be “received;” the inward part, the Body and Blood of Christ, “which are verily and indeed taken and received by the “faithful [that is by Christian people] in the Lord’s Supper.” What he meant by these words will be seen by the following extracts from his notes on the Book of Common Prayer:—

“*Bread and Wine.*] It is confessed by all divines, that upon the word “of the Consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ is really and substantially “present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive It; and all this not “after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible “manner. But there yet remains this controversy among some of them, whether the Body of Christ be present only in the *use* of the Sacrament, and in “the act of eating, and not otherwise. They that hold the affirmative, as the “Lutherans (in Confess. Sax.) and all Calvinists, do seem to me to depart “from all [writers of] antiquity, which place the Presence of Christ in the “virtue and benediction used by the priest, and not in the use of eating the “Sacrament. And this did most Protestants grant and profess at first, though “now the Calvinists make popish magic of it in their licentious blasphemy.” “*Additional notes to the Book of Common Prayer.*

“*What is the inward part or thing signified?*] I cannot see where any “real difference is betwixt us [*i.e.*, the Churches of England and Rome], about

“ this Real Presence, if we could give over the study of contradiction, and understand one another aright.—*Notes on the Catechism.*

“ In the Sacrament of the Eucharist or the Lord’s Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore the Whole of Christ, is verily and indeed present, and is verily partaken by us, and verily combined with the Sacramental signs, as being not only significative, but exhibitory ; so that in the Bread duly given and received, the Body of Christ is given and received ; in the wine given and received, the Blood of Christ is given and received ; and thus there is a communion of the Whole of Christ, in the communion of the Sacrament.”—*As quoted and translated in Knox’s Remains*, vol. ii. p. 163.

Bishop Morton bitterly inveighs against the Roman writers because they class the members of the English Churches “ with those heretics who denied that the True Body of Christ was in the Eucharist, and maintained only a figure and image of Christ’s Body, seeing that our difference is not about the Truth or Reality of Presence, but about the true manner of the being and receiving thereof.”—*Catholic Appeal*, p. 93. ed. 1610.

Bishop Andrewes, in his controversy with Cardinal Bellarmine, expressly admits that there was no difference between them as to the Real Presence in the Sacrament, “ but only as to the mode of that Presence, whether the Bread and Wine were transubstantiated or not ; ” and elsewhere, after discussing the Roman teaching, he adds :—

“ As these are *their* (the Romanists) imaginations, so we want not *ours*. For many among us fancy only a Sacrament in this action, and look strange at the mention of a Sacrifice ; whereas we not only use It as a Nourishment spiritual, as that It is too, but as a Mean also to renew a ‘ covenant ’ with God by virtue of that ‘ Sacrifice,’ as the Psalmist speaketh. So our Saviour in the institution telleth us, in the twenty-second chapter of Luke and twentieth verse, and the Apostle, in the thirteenth chapter of Hebrews and tenth verse. And the old writers use no less the word Sacrifice than Sacrament, altar than table, offer than eat ; but both indifferently, to shew that there is both.”*

Elsewhere he writes : “ Christ Himself, in and with the Sacrament, apart from and without the Sacrament, *where-soever* HE IS, is to be worshipped.”†

* Vol. V. p. 67.

† Andrewes’ Resp. ad Bellarminum, viii. p. 266.—*A. C. Library.*

Dr. Donne, Dean of S. Paul's, writes: "But yet though
 "this bread be not so transubstantiated, we refuse not the
 "words of the Fathers, in which they have expressed them-
 "selves in this mystery, 'That that Bread is His Body now'—
 "that that Bread is made His Body which was not so be-
 "fore,—'that that Bread is changed.' "*"

Dr. Sutton writes:—

"We say with S. Ambrose, that there is not taken from bread the substance
 "thereof, but that there is adjoined the grace of Christ's Body after a manner
 "ineffable."

And he adds:—

"Let us all forbear on both sides needless and unprofitable disputes. Unless
 "Thou, Lord, hadst said it, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood,' who would
 "have believed it? Unless Thou hadst said, O holy Christ, 'Take, eat; drink
 "ye all of this,' who durst have touched it?" p. 299—301.

Bishop White writes: "The more learned Jesuits themselves
 "acknowledge that Protestants believe the Real Presence of
 "Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist."†—Con-
 ference with Fisher, p. 178, from which one may see that
 the Protestants of the present day, are not the Protestants
 of 1630.

Archbishop Laud writes:—"As for the Church of Eng-
 "land, nothing is more plain than that it believes and
 "teaches the true and real Presence of Christ in the
 "Eucharist."‡

Archbishop Laurence writes:

"As I like not those that say, He is bodily there, so I like not those
 "that say, His Body is not there, because Christ saith It is there, and the
 "Church of England saith It is there, and the Church of God ever said It is
 "there; and that truly and substantially and essentially: and that not only
 "by way of representation or commemoration; and yet without either *con*,
 "*sub*, or *trans*, which the ancient Church said not: by a real, and nevertheless
 "a spiritual and mystical and supernatural presentation and exhibition. For
 "why should our Saviour bid us take what He would not have us receive?"

* Sermons Ed. 1640, p. 37. Fourth Sermon on the Nativity.

† Conference with Fisher, p. 178.

‡ Conference with Fisher, p. 294, sec. 35.

"We must *believe* It is there; we must not *know* What is there; our faith may see It, our sense cannot; It is a mystery they all say, and It were no mystery if It were known; His Presence they determined, the manner of His Presence they determined not; they say He is there, and they say the Lord knows how."—*Dr. Laurence, Sermon before the King*, p. 17, 18.

Dr. Heylin writes :

"Bishop Ridley doth not only call it the Sacrament of the Altar, affirming thus, that in the Sacrament of the Altar is the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, &c."—*Heylin, Coal from the Altar*, p. 15, *quoting Ridley*.

Bishop Forbes writes that "The Body and Blood of Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Eucharist."
—*Consid. Modest. de Euchar.* i. 1—7.

Dr. Thorndike says :—

"I suppose that the Body and Blood of Christ may be adored wheresoever They are and is not the Presence Thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist a just occasion presently to express by the bodily act of adoration that inward honour which we always carry towards our Lord Christ as God? ... I do believe it was so practised and done in the Ancient Church."*

The learned Dr. Mede writes :

"The all-wise God, who knew our weakness, hath so ordained in the mystery of this Holy Sacrament, that It is a mystical Incarnation of Christ into every one who receives It. Whence Gregory Nazianzen defines the Eucharist a *Communion of the Incarnation of God*. For in that He affirms the Bread to be His Body, and the Wine to be His Blood; by receiving this Body and Blood of Christ, and so changing It into the substance of our body and into our blood by way of nourishment, the Body of Christ becomes our body, and His Blood is made our blood, and we become in a mystical manner flesh of His Flesh and bone of His Bone."†

George Herbert writes : "Drink This, which *before ye drink* is Blood."‡ Elsewhere he writes : "The country parson, especially at Communion times, is in great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him."§ Not, to be sure, as if Herbert meant to contradict S. Thomas Aquinas, who says, that though the Sacrament be Christ's Body and Blood, yet is not Christ

* Quoted p. 143 in Keble's Eucharistical Adoration.

† Disc. xiv. p. 254. Ed. 1672.

‡ Herbert's Poetical Works. "The Invitation."

§ Quoted by Keble as above, p. 142.

broken when the Bread is broken ; for He is there, not by Natural Presence, but by Supernatural.

Archbishop Bramhall, arguing with a writer of the Roman Church, says :

“ Having viewed all your strength with a single eye, I find not one of your arguments that comes home to transubstantiation, but only to a True Real Presence, which no genuine son of the Church of England did ever deny ;—no nor your adversary himself. Christ said, ‘ This is my Body ; ’ what He said, we do stedfastly believe. He said not, after this or that manner, *neque con, neque sub, neque trans*. And therefore we place it among the opinions of the schools, not among the articles of our faith. The Holy Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of peace and unity, ought not to be made the matter of strife and contention.”—*Works*, fol. ed. p. 15.

He says again, speaking of the Roman Church :

“ Abate us transubstantiation, and those things which are consequent of their determination of the *manner* of Presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular. They who are ordained priests ought to have power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ ; that is to make Them present.”—P. 485.

Hear how Bishop Ken, the author of the Morning and Evening Hymns, pours forth his supplication to his Saviour, “ O God Incarnate, how Thou canst give us Thy Flesh to eat and thy Blood to drink, how Thy Flesh is Meat indeed ; how Thou, Who art in Heaven, art *present on the Altar* I can by no means explain, but I firmly believe it all because Thou has said it.” Ken, who could rebuke a King to his face for shameful vice, was not the man to say this if he had not believed it in his heart. Hear Bishop Jeremy Taylor’s private prayer at the time of Consecration : “ O Heavenly Father, according to Thy glorious mercies and promises send Thy Holy Ghost upon our hearts, and let Him also descend upon *these gifts*, that by His good, His Holy, His Glorious Presence, He may sanctify and enlighten our hearts, He may bless and sanctify these gifts, that this bread may become the Holy Body of Christ, and this chalice may become the life-giving Blood of Christ. Amen.” Bishop Wilson calls the Eucharist “ The pure unbloody sacrifice.”

Bishop Sparrow, Dr. Hammond, Bishop Fell, Bishop Hackett, Bishop Sherlock, Bishop Bull, Dr. Hickes, Dean Comber, Archbishop Wake, Johnson in his "Unblood Sacrifice," Archbishop Sharp, Wheatley on the Communion Prayer, and a host of others, bear the same testimony.

My brethren, I have so far endeavoured to state the doctrine of the Real Presence and its evidence, as drawn from the Bible, the writings of the Primitive Church in the ages nearest the Apostles, and some of the greatest divines of our own English Church. I reserve till next Sunday evening the question what the doctrine of transubstantiation really means, and wherein it differs from the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Communion.

The doctrine of transubstantiation, *as commonly understood*, implies an idea of some Earthly Presence, but we do not believe that the Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament is in any way carnal or physical; we do not believe that the Consecration changes in any way the matter of the Bread and Wine, but resting on our Lord's most sure promise—resting on the undoubted belief of the undivided Church, we believe, and are sure—*more* sure than of what we know by our senses, for they *do* deceive us, but God *never* does—we believe and are sure that in a heavenly and spiritual, yet most real and true manner, the Bread, though remaining Bread, becomes the Body of Christ; and the Wine, though remaining Wine, becomes His Blood.

In Heaven our Lord's Body exists in Its natural mode of existence, in the manner natural to glorified bodies; that is to say, It is visible, tangible, and glorious. In the Blessed Sacrament It exists in a supernatural way, not having *quantity* or dimensions, or any other property which pertains to the natural mode of existence of bodies; but by the Presence of which we can declare nothing, since nothing else is revealed except that *It is there*.

And oh, my brethren, if It is not there, what is left to us in Holy Communion but a barren form? Well was it spoken by a living Bishop of our own day, and of our own Communion: "However much persons may seek to envelope in "ambiguous phrase the notions which they possess, the "whole matter must be brought to the tremendous issue of "Real Presence or Real Absence."* My brethren, it must be so; if It be *more* than bread, it cannot be *less* than Christ—it *is* His Real Presence, or His real absence—Oh, most dark and gloomy absence! most blessed Presence of our Lord! Oh healing touch of His Sacred Flesh, is it indeed lost to us in the English Church? The Lord forbid it. What wondrous power was in that touch when He lived on earth; how when He touched the deaf man he heard; the dumb man, he spoke; the blind man, he saw; the sick were healed; the dead were raised. Even with material substance intervening (as in the Sacraments), it was still the same. The woman who touched the hem of His garment—that intervening substance—the type of His Sacraments, (as the Fathers explained it), had her issue of blood stanchied.

When He raised to life the widow's son, He did not touch the *corpse*, but the *bier*, and "the young man arose," and He delivered him to his mother.

How *could* He say that it was "expedient for us that He should go away," if the touch of His Sacred Body could no longer reach us after His Ascension?" But "is the Lord's Arm shortened that it cannot save?" Has the touch of His Sacred Body lost its power, because It has become a glorified Body.

* Bishop Cosin and Bishop Geste give the clearest testimony as to their belief in the Real Presence, but as I shall have to refer to them both in my next Sermon, when treating of the Rubric at the end of the Communion Office and the 28th Article, I do not quote them here.

Hear S. Cyril: "Consider, again (he saith), how great profit
 " the touch of His Holy Flesh hath, for It driveth away
 " even divers diseases, and many devils, and overthroweth
 " the power of the devil, and healeth such a multitude in
 " one moment of time. And though He could by word and
 " will accomplish these miracles, yet, that He may teach u
 " needful lessons, He layeth His Hands also upon the sick
 " For we needed to learn that the Holy Flesh bore th
 " efficacy of the power of the Word, which [Flesh] He mad
 " His Own, having implanted a Divine Power therein. Le
 " It, then, touch us also; yea, rather, we It, through th
 " Mystic Eucharist, that It may deliver us, too, from sick
 " ness of our souls, and from the inroad and lawless migh
 " of the devils."* And, again, after stating a multitude o
 instances of the power of His touch, he adds: "But if by
 " the touch alone of His Holy Flesh He giveth life to
 " that which is decayed, how shall we not profit yet more
 " richly by the life-giving Eucharist when we taste It? Fo
 " It will transform altogether into Its own good, *i. e.* immor
 " tality, those who partake of it. Marvel not hereat nor
 " inquire in Jewish manner, 'How?'"†

I do not deny that other able and holy men in the English
 Church have written differently about Holy Communion from
 those authors whom I have quoted; there always have been,
 there are *now*, good and pious men in the English Church
 holding opinions different from those which I have ex
 pressed, and if by raising my hand to expel them from
 the Church, I could do so, God forbid I should raise
 my hand; but I do say that it is hard to be told that
 what we teach in such company as those names I have
 given you in this Sermon—a doctrine taught as we think

* On S. Luke iv. 38, p. 167.

† On S. John vi. 54, p. 361.

by Our Lord and His Apostles—taught certainly by S. Ignatius, who filled the See of Antioch where men were first called Christians, and who was consecrated bishop by an apostle;—taught by S. Ambrose, and held by the whole of that army of martyrs who had won their crowns when he sang the first *Te Deum*;—taught by S. Chrysostom, “the golden mouthed,” whose prayer in our Liturgy is said to this day, morning and evening, wherever the English tongue is spoken;—a doctrine called universal by S. Augustine, in the fourth century, when Christendom was yet undivided, and when the rule of Faith* was that what was held *always* and *everywhere* and *by all the Church* was true, and *that alone*, so that novelties in religion had not then the chance of success that they have now, and heresy was put down—a power we seem to have lost;—a doctrine held alike by the martyred Ridley and the unstable Cranmer before his mournful fall;—held by the devout and holy Andrewes, the bold uncompromising Laud, the brave and gentle Ken, by Overall and Bramhall, by Lawrence and Bull, by the eloquent Taylor and the saintly Wilson;—held by the sweet George Herbert, the pattern of all “country parsons,” the genius, the poet, the saint; held too by him for whom our tears are scarcely dry, the only one since Herbert’s day who ever rivalled him in all things, for he too was the saint, the genius, the poet, and the pattern for country parsons in *his* day, higher far as a *country parson* than those who sought and won the Church’s higher offices, whose “Christian Year” was the type of all his years—the saintly Keble.—It is hard to be told in such companionship, and that by men, some of whom the Church of our Reformers, tolerant as they were, would not have tolerated, that the doctrine which we teach is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

* Quod Semper Quod ubique Quod ab omnibus.

Oh, my brethren, it is not true—thank God it is not true—that the English Church in which the providence of God has placed us, and to which, as our mother, He has bound us by every tie of tender and sacred duty—has lost the Blessed Gift once delivered to the saints—the Body and Blood of our ascended Lord, which is our bond of union with universal Christendom in every age, and in every land; “for we, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that One Bread,” even “The Living Bread Which came down from Heaven.” 1 Cor. x. 17; S. John vi. 51.

. Many parts of this Sermon were omitted in delivery for want of time.

